

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/717, 042 09/20/96 PALLEY

I 30-3744-17

QM32/0627

EXAMINER

VIRGINIA S. ANDREWS
ALLIEDSIGNAL INC
LAW DEPARTMENT
P O BOX 31
PETERSBURG VA 23804

ELOSHWAY, N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3727

DATE MAILED:

06/27/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 08/717,042	Applicant(s) PALLEY ET AL.
	Examiner Niki M. Eloshway	Art Unit 3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 12,48-50 and 54-66 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3-11,13-47 and 51-53 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.

19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1. The finality of the previous Office Action (P.N. 18) is withdrawn. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

Election/Restriction

2. Claims 12, 48-50 and 54-66 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected species. Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 20-28, 30, 33-43, 45, 47, 51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacks (U.S. 5,249,534) in view of MacDonald et al. (U.S. 3,822,807). Sacks discloses the claimed invention except for the blast mitigating material. MacDonald et al. teach that it is known to provide a container with foam. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the container of Sacks with the foam of MacDonald et al., in order to prevent a rise in pressure within the container.

Sacks teaches a container set forth in col. 1 line 43 through col. 2 line 23. The bands of Sacks can be made of SPECTRA, as set forth in col. 1 lines 33-42. This SPECTRA material is the same material used in applicant's invention, and therefore has the same characteristics.

5. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 20, 23, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 38, 42, 44, 46, 47 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacks in view of Gettle et al. Sacks discloses the claimed invention except for the blast mitigating material. Gettle et al. teach that it is known to provide a container with aqueous foam (see line 11 of the Abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the container of Sacks with the aqueous foam of Gettle et al., in order to attenuate pressure waves.

6. Claims 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacks in view of MacDonald et al., as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Lewis (U.S. 0,674,009). The modified container of Sacks discloses the claimed invention except for the first and second bands being tubes. Lewis teaches that it is known to provide a container, made of three bands, wherein the first and second bands form tubes (see elements B and C). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the modified container of Sacks with the first and second bands forming tubes, as taught by Lewis, in order to protect the entire inner container, including the bottom wall thereof.

7. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacks (U.S. 5,249,534) in view of MacDonald et al. (U.S. 3,822,807) and Lewis (U.S. 0,674,009). Sacks discloses the claimed invention except for the blast mitigating material and except for the bands forming tubes. MacDonald et al. teach that it is known to provide a container with foam. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the container of Sacks with the foam of MacDonald et al., in order to prevent a rise in pressure within the container.

Lewis teaches that it is known to provide a container, made of three bands, wherein the first and second bands form tubes (see elements B and C). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the modified container of Sacks with the first and second bands forming tubes, as taught by Lewis, in order to protect the entire inner container, including the bottom wall thereof.

Conclusion

8. THIS ACTION IS MADE NON-FINAL.

9. In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 3720 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (703)305-3579. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into group 3720 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Niki M. Eloshway whose telephone number is (703) 308-1606. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the 3700 Customer Service Office at (703) 306-5648.

Allan N. Shoap
Allan N. Shoap
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700

Niki M. Eloshway/nme
Niki M. Eloshway/nme
Patent Examiner
June 25, 2001